

UNIFORM ESTIMATES ON PARAPRODUCTS

CAMIL MUSCALU, TERENCE TAO, AND CHRISTOPH THIELE

Dedicated to our late friend and admired mathematician Tom Wolff

ABSTRACT. We prove uniform L^p estimates (Theorem 1.1) for a family of paraproducts and corresponding maximal operators.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to prove certain uniform estimates on paraproducts. Our motivation for this result is that we need it in a sequel [9] of this paper, where we study uniform estimates for multilinear singular integrals as in [8] with a one parameter modulation symmetry. Despite our current narrow objective, the uniform paraproduct estimates in the current article may be of independent interest by themselves.

As motivation, we begin by defining a standard paraproduct form of degree $n \geq 2$ to be a multilinear form of the type

$$\Lambda(f_1, \dots, f_n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \prod_{i=1}^n Q_{i,k} f_i(x) dx, \quad (1)$$

where the $Q_{i,k}$ are convolution operators

$$Q_{i,k} f = f * \phi_{i,k}$$

with convolution kernels whose Fourier transforms $\widehat{\phi}_{i,k}$ are bump functions adapted to $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2^k\}$ and we assume

$$\widehat{\phi}_{1,k}(0) = \widehat{\phi}_{2,k}(0) = 0 \quad (2)$$

for all k . Here and in the sequel, a bump function ϕ adapted to an interval I is a function supported in I and satisfying

$$\|\phi^{(\alpha)}\|_{\infty} \leq |I|^{-\alpha}$$

for all derivatives $\phi^{(\alpha)}$ of order $0 \leq \alpha \leq N$ for some large N (see [10]).

Classical Calderon-Zygmund theory gives the following standard estimate:

$$\Lambda(f_1, \dots, f_n) \leq C_p \prod_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|_{p_i} \quad (3)$$

where $1 < p_i < \infty$ are any exponents satisfying the homogeneity condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p_i} = 1. \quad (4)$$

and C_p is a constant depending only on the tuple (p_i) .

To see this estimate we use Hölder's inequality to estimate the left hand side of (3) by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \prod_{i=1}^2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |Q_{ik}f_i(x)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \prod_{i>2} \sup_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} |Q_{i,k}f_i(x)| dx \\ & \leq \prod_{i=1}^2 \|Sf_i\|_{p_i} \prod_{i>2} \|Mf_i\|_{p_i} . \end{aligned}$$

Here S denotes an appropriate Littlewood-Paley square function operator, and M denotes the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator. Now the above claim follows easily from boundedness of S and M in L^p for $1 < p < \infty$. Observe that the same proof works if we replace $Q_{i,k}$ by $Q_{i,k+k_i}$ in (1) for some arbitrary integers k_i .

It is also well known ([6]) that it is sufficient to require condition (2) only for $\widehat{\phi}_{1,k}$. We shall sketch a proof under the more restrictive assumption that $\widehat{\phi}_{1,k}$ vanishes of $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2^{k-L}\}$ for some given $L \geq 1$. Indeed, in this case we can write for each $i > 1$

$$Q_{i,k} = \sum_{l=1}^{n+L} Q_{i,k,l} ,$$

where the symbol $\widehat{\phi}_{i,k,l}$ of the Fourier multiplier $Q_{i,k,l}$, is adapted to $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2^{k-l}\}$ and vanishes on the smaller interval $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2^{k-l-2}\}$ except in the case $l = n+L$ when we do not require any vanishing. Then we can split $\Lambda(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ as in (1) by the distributive law into a sum of polynomially in L many multilinear operators, all of which are multiples of standard paraproducts after possibly permuting the indices, except for the term

$$\int \sum_k Q_{1,k}f_1(x) \prod_{i>1} Q_{i,k,n+L}f_i(x) dx .$$

However, this term simply vanishes, because the Fourier transform of

$$\prod_{i>1} (f_i * \phi_{i,k,n+L})$$

is supported in $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq n2^{k-n-L}\}$ whereas the Fourier transform of

$$\overline{f_1 * \phi_{1,k}}$$

vanishes on $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2^{k-L}\}$, so the inner product of these two vanishes by Plancherel.

Observe that in the above argument, the constant in the estimate for Λ depends on L . However, this dependence is artificial as one can show a bound (3) with a constant independent of L and independent of any constants k_i as above that we may insert in the definition of Λ . The purpose of this article is to prove a very general version of this uniformity result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \geq 2$, and let $\Omega \in \mathbf{Z}^n$ be a set of the form*

$$\Omega = \{(j_1, \dots, j_n) : j_{i_\alpha} \geq j_{i'_\alpha} + A_\alpha \text{ for all } 1 \leq \alpha \leq K\} \quad (5)$$

where $K \geq 0$ is an integer and $i_\alpha, i'_\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $A_\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}$ for all $1 \leq \alpha \leq K$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $j \in \mathbf{Z}$, let $Q_{j,i}$ be a Fourier multiplier whose symbol is a bump function

adapted to $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2^j\}$ that vanishes at the origin. Then one has the estimates

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \Omega} \prod_{i=1}^n Q_{j_i, i} f_i \right| \leq C_{p,n,K} \prod_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|_{p_i} \quad (6)$$

$$\left\| \sup_{j_n \in \mathbf{Z}} \left| \sum_{(j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \Omega} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} Q_{j_i, i} f_i \right| \right\|_{p'_n} \leq C_{p,n,K} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \|f_i\|_{p_i} \quad (7)$$

for all $1 < p_i < \infty$ obeying (4), where $1/p'_n + 1/p_n = 1$ and the constant $C_{p,n,K}$ depends on the p_i , n , K , but is independent of the A_i and f_i .

The set Ω in this theorem is a convex polytope in $\mathbf{Z}^n$ which is invariant under translation in direction $(1, \dots, 1)$. It has essentially K faces. We remark that the number K of independent constraints in (5) can be bounded by a function of n , so the dependence of $C_{p,n,K}$ on K serves only to emphasize that we have better estimates for small K .

To compare this result further with the existing literature, we observe that we can write a paraproduct as in (1) or (6) in the multiplier form

$$\int_{\sum \xi_i = 0} m(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \prod_{i=1}^n \widehat{f_i}(\xi_i) d\sigma$$

where the multiplier m satisfies the symbol estimates

$$\partial^\alpha m(\xi) \leq C |\xi|^{-|\alpha|} \quad (8)$$

for any multi index α up to some fixed large order and for all vectors ξ . Under this condition on the multiplier, standard paraproduct theory (e.g. [1]-[6]) gives (6). However, for the multipliers arising from Theorem 1.1, the constant in (8) depends on the set Ω . Hence the point of the theorem is uniformity in Ω .

The multipliers of the theorem do satisfy a bound of the type

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^n \partial_i^{\alpha_i} \right) m(\xi) \leq C \prod_{i=1}^n |\xi_i|^{-\alpha_i} \quad (9)$$

with a constant C independent of Ω . However, as is shown in [7], this condition is in general not sufficient to guarantee an estimate (6). If the multiplier m is of tensor product type

$$m(\xi) = \prod_{i=1}^n m_i(\xi_i)$$

in addition to satisfying (9), then the integrand in the definition of Λ splits into a tensor product and one can trivially show (6) by reducing to the one dimensional case. Observe that the multipliers arising in Theorem 1.1 do not split as tensor products because of the constraints on Ω . However, the idea of the theorem is that the special structure of Ω still allows to recover enough of the good behaviour of the tensor product case.

We shall not pursue here results for endpoints $p_i = \infty$ or $p_i = \text{BMO}$.

We prove Theorem 1.1 in Sections 2-4. It is obtained by induction on the dimension n of Ω . The main tools are the Hölder, Littlewood-Paley, and Hardy-Littlewood maximal

inequalities, together with some combinatorial manipulations to break Ω up into simpler objects. The latter shall be most easily accomplished using the language of graph theory.

We shall specialize Theorem 1.1 to a form which will be convenient for our application to multilinear singular integrals with modulation symmetries.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $n \geq 2$, and let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ be integers. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $j \in \mathbf{Z}$, let $\pi_{j,i}$ be a Fourier multiplier whose symbol is a bump function adapted to $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2^{j+M_i}\}$. Suppose that for each $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ there exists at least one $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that the symbol of $\pi_{j,i}$ vanishes at the origin. Then one has the estimate*

$$\sum_j \left| \int \prod_{i=1}^n \pi_{j,i} f_i \right| \leq C_{p,n,K} \prod_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|_{p_i} \quad (10)$$

for all $1 < p_i < \infty$ obeying $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p_i} = 1$, where the constant $C_{p,n,K}$ depends on the p_i , n , K , but is independent of the M_i and f_i .

We prove this Corollary in Section 5. It shall follow easily from Theorem 1.1 after some normalizations and dyadic decompositions on the $\pi_{j,i}$. It is easy to see that some sort of cancellation condition on the $\pi_{j,i}$, such as the vanishing condition given above, is necessary, as can be seen by testing (10) when the $\hat{f}_i$ are all equal to the same approximation to the delta function at the origin. It is important that the absolute values in (10) are not inside the integral, as the estimate is easily seen to be false otherwise.

The first author was partially supported by a Sloan Dissertation Fellowship. The second author is a Clay Prize Fellow and is supported by grants from the Sloan and Packard Foundations. The third author was partially supported by a Sloan Fellowship and by NSF grants DMS 9985572 and DMS 9970469.

We would like to point out that Tom Wolff's first major result, his simplification of the proof of the corona theorem, heavily relied on estimates for paraproducts.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

It will be convenient to write the paraproducts using the language of graph theory.

Definition 2.1. *Let V be a finite set. A (weighted directed) edge supported in V is a triplet $e = (v_1, v_2, A) \in V \times V \times \mathbf{Z}$. We refer to $v_1 =: v_1(e)$, $v_2 =: v_2(e)$, and $A(e)$ as the initial vertex, final vertex, and weight of e respectively. A (weighted directed) graph $G = (V, E)$ is a finite collection of vertices V and a finite collection E of weighted directed edges e supported in V . We call $|V|$ and $|E|$ the order and complexity of G respectively.*

We allow multiple edges from one vertex to another, as well as edges from a vertex to itself, although such edges are usually redundant or trivial in our applications. We shall henceforth omit the modifiers “weighted directed” in the sequel.

If p is a directed path in G , we define the *weight* $A(p)$ of p to be the sum of all the weights of the edges in G . If V' is a subset of G , we define $G|_{V'}$ to be the graph with vertex set V' and edges $\{e \in E : v_1(e), v_2(e) \in V'\}$. We write $G - V'$ for $G|_{V \setminus V'}$.

If E' is a set of edges whose vertices are in V , we write $G \cup E'$ for $(V, E \cup E')$ and $G - E'$ for $(V, E - E')$.

If $G = (V, E)$ is a graph and V_1, V_2 are disjoint subsets of G , we say that V_1, V_2 are *adjacent* if there exists an edge in G with one vertex in V_1 and the other in V_2 .

Every graph can be associated with a polytope:

Definition 2.2. Let $G = (V, E)$. We define the polytope $\Omega(G) \subset \mathbf{Z}^V$ of G to be the set

$$\Omega(G) := \{(j_v)_{v \in V} \in \mathbf{Z}^V : j_{v_1(e)} \geq j_{v_2(e)} + A(e) \text{ for all } e \in E\}.$$

We shall often write $\vec{j}$ for $(j_v)_{v \in V}$.

Note that $\Omega(G)$ is empty if G contains directed circuits of positive weight. (This implication can be reversed, but we shall not need this here). Conversely, if E is empty, then $\Omega(G) = \mathbf{Z}^V$.

Definition 2.3. If $e = (v_1, v_2, A)$ is an edge, we define the dual e^* of e by $e^* := (v_2, v_1, -A+1)$.

We observe the basic relationship

$$\Omega(V, E) = \Omega(V, E \cup \{e\}) \uplus \Omega(V, E \cup \{e^*\}) \quad (11)$$

whenever (V, E) is a graph and e is an edge with vertices in V , and $\uplus$ denotes disjoint union. The identity (11) allows us to replace an edge e in a graph by its dual, modulo objects of lesser complexity.

Theorem 1.1 is concerned with a certain graph of order n . We shall fix this n : in what follows all graphs shall have order less than n . Observe that while we do not exclude multiple edges, in what follows we can easily reduce graphs to not contain multiple edges, and thus the complexity of all graphs can be assumed to be less than $(n+1)^2$. For each $v \in V$ and $j \in \mathbf{Z}$, we fix Q_j^v to be a Fourier multiplier whose symbol is a bump function adapted to $\{\xi : 2^{10nj} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{10nj+1}\}$. We use powers of 2^{10n} rather than 2 to obtain better lacunary separation properties.

We shall need two types of paraproducts: non-maximal paraproducts, which we define as multi-linear forms; and maximal paraproducts, which we define as multi-linear operators.

Definition 2.4. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with $|V| \leq n$, and suppose that $\vec{f} = (f_v)_{v \in V}$ is a family of test functions on $\mathbb{R}$. We define the non-maximal paraproduct Λ_G to be the quantity

$$\Lambda_G(\vec{f}) := \sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G)} \int \prod_{v \in V} Q_{j_v}^v f_v.$$

We define the order and complexity of Λ_G to be the order and complexity of G respectively.

Definition 2.5. Let $G = (V \uplus \{v_*\}, E)$ be a graph with a distinguished vertex v_* and $|V| \leq n$, and suppose $\vec{f} = (f_v)_{v \in V}$ is a family of test functions on $\mathbb{R}$. We define the maximal paraproduct $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ to be the function

$$\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) = \sup_{j_* \in \mathbf{Z}} \left| \sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G): j_{v_*} = j_*} \prod_{v \in V} Q_{j_v}^v f_v \right|.$$

We define the order and complexity of $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ to be $|V| + \frac{1}{2}$ and $|E|$ respectively.

Note that a maximal paraproduct on n functions is slightly higher order than a non-maximal paraproduct on n functions, but slightly lower order than a non-maximal paraproduct on $n + 1$ functions. From (11) we observe the identity

$$\Lambda_G(\vec{f}) = \Lambda_{G \cup \{e\}}(\vec{f}) + \Lambda_{G \cup \{e^*\}}(\vec{f}) \quad (12)$$

and the triangle inequalities

$$\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) \leq \Lambda_{G \cup \{e\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) + \Lambda_{G \cup \{e^*\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) \quad (13)$$

and

$$\Lambda_{G \cup \{e\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) \leq \Lambda_G^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) + \Lambda_{G \cup \{e^*\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) \quad (14)$$

whenever e is an edge with vertices in the vertex set of G .

We shall prove

Theorem 2.6. • *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a non-empty graph with $|V| \leq n$, and $\vec{f} = (f_v)_{v \in V}$ a family of test functions. Then we have*

$$|\Lambda_G(\vec{f})| \leq C_{(p_v), n} \prod_{v \in V} \|f_v\|_{p_v} \quad (15)$$

whenever $1 < p_v < \infty$ and $\sum_{v \in V} 1/p_v = 1$.

• *Let $G = (V \uplus \{v_*\}, E)$ be a non-empty graph with $|V| \leq n$, and $\vec{f} = (f_v)_{v \in V}$ a family of test functions. Then we have*

$$\|\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}(\vec{f})\|_{p_*} \leq C_{p_*, (p_v), n} \prod_{v \in V} \|f_v\|_{p_v} \quad (16)$$

whenever $1 < p_*, p_v < \infty$ and $\sum_{v \in V} 1/p_v = 1/p_*$.

Theorem 1.1 then follows easily from rescaled versions of (15) and a dyadic decomposition of the multipliers $Q_{k,j}$.

The theorem is easily verified from the standard linear theory of maximal truncated singular integrals (see e.g. [10]) when the order of the paraproduct is $1\frac{1}{2}$ (the lowest order in which the statement is not void). Now suppose the order is at least two and let $n = |V|$ be the number of functions. We shall divide into two cases.

Definition 2.7. • *We say that Λ_G (resp. $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$) has a dominant frequency $v_0 \in V$ if one has*

$$j_{v_0} > j_v$$

whenever $\vec{j} \in \Omega(G)$ and $v \in V \setminus \{v_0\}$.

• *We say that Λ_G (resp. $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$) has two competing frequencies $v_1, v_2 \in V$ if $v_1 \neq v_2$ and*

$$j_{v_1} = j_{v_2}$$

whenever $\vec{j} \in \Omega(G)$. A paraproduct with two competing frequencies v_1, v_2 is in standard form if $\{v_2\}$ is not adjacent to $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ (resp. $\{v_*\} \cup V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$).

Note that the frequency j_{v_*} plays no role in determining whether a maximal paraproduct has a dominant frequency or two competing frequencies.

From (12), (13) and the introduction of edges of the form $(v, v', 0)$ or their duals, we observe that any paraproduct can be estimated by the sum of at most C_n paraproducts

of the same order (each with complexity increased by at most C_n), such that each such paraproduct either has a dominant frequency or two competing frequency. Note that any paraproduct with two competing frequencies can be placed in standard form, by replacing any edge with vertex v_2 with the corresponding edge with vertex v_1 , and then adding the edges $(v_1, v_2, 0)$ and $(v_2, v_1, 0)$.

If a non-maximal paraproduct Λ_G has a dominant frequency v_0 , then the summands have frequency approximately $2^{10nj_{v_0}}$, and so Λ_G vanishes identically.

Now suppose a non-maximal paraproduct Λ_G has two competing frequencies v_1, v_2 and is in standard form. Assuming first $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\} \neq \emptyset$ we can use Cauchy-Schwarz to estimate

$$\left| \sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G)} \prod_{v \in V} Q_{j_v}^v f_v \right| \leq S_{v_1}(f_{v_1}) S_{v_2}(f_{v_2}) \sup_{j_*} \left| \sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G): j_{v_1}=j_{v_2}=j_*} \prod_{v \in V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}} Q_{j_v}^v f_v \right|$$

where $S_v(f_v)$ is the Littlewood-Paley square function

$$S_v(f_v) := \left(\sum_k |Q_k^v f_v|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

From this and Hölder's inequality, and the boundedness of S_v on L^p , $1 < p < \infty$ we have

$$\Lambda_G((f_v)_{v \in V}) \leq C_{p_1, p_2} \|f_{v_1}\|_{p_1} \|f_{v_2}\|_{p_2} \|\Lambda_{G|_{V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}}}^{[v_1]}(\{f_v\}_{v \in V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}})\|_{p_*} \quad (17)$$

whenever $1 < p_1, p_2, p_* < \infty$ are such that $1/p_1 + 1/p_2 + 1/p_* = 1$. If $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\} = \emptyset$, then the above calculation holds without the factor involving the maximal paraproduct, and we immediately conclude Theorem 2.6.

From the above remarks we see that the estimate (15) for non-maximal paraproducts automatically follows from the estimate (16) for maximal paraproducts of smaller order. Thus it remains to consider maximal paraproducts.

To estimate maximal paraproducts we require some further definitions.

Definition 2.8. • A maximal paraproduct $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ is separable if one can write $V = V_1 \uplus V_2$ where V_1 and V_2 are non-empty and not adjacent.

- A maximal paraproduct $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ with dominant frequency $v_0 \in V$ is said to be semi-direct if $\{v_*\}$ and $V \setminus \{v_0\}$ are not adjacent.
- A maximal paraproduct $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ with two competing frequencies $v_1, v_2 \in V$ is said to be semi-direct if $\{v_*\}$ and $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ are not adjacent.
- A maximal paraproduct is said to be good if it is of one of the above three types.

We now show that the estimate (16) for good maximal paraproducts follows from an application of Theorem 2.6 applied to paraproducts of strictly lower order.

If $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ is separable, then we have the pointwise estimate

$$\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}((f_v)_{v \in V}) \leq \Lambda_{G|_{V_1 \cup \{v_*\}}}^{[v_*]}((f_v)_{v \in V_1}) \Lambda_{G|_{V_2 \cup \{v_*\}}}^{[v_*]}((f_v)_{v \in V_2}). \quad (18)$$

The claim then follows from Hölder.

Now suppose $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ is semi-direct with dominant frequency v_0 . We shall assume first $V \setminus \{v_0\}$ is not empty. In this case we observe the identity

$$\sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G): j_{v_*}=j_*} \prod_{v \in V} Q_{j_v}^v f_v = \sum_{j_0: (j_*, j_0) \in \Omega(G|_{\{v_*, v_0\}})} \sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G - \{v_*\}): j_{v_0}=j_0} \prod_{v \in V} Q_{j_v}^v f_v$$

for all j_* . We may of course assume that $\Omega(G|_{\{v_*, v_0\}})$ is non-empty. From the dominant frequency hypothesis we thus have $j_{v_0} > j_v$ whenever $\vec{j} \in \Omega(G - \{v_*\})$ and $v \in V \setminus \{v_0\}$. In particular, the inner summand has Fourier transform supported on the annulus $\{2^{10nj_0-3n} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{10nj_0+3n}\}$. Since $\{j_0 : (j_*, j_0) \in \Omega(G|_{\{v_*, v_0\}})\}$ is an interval (possibly infinite) for each v_* , we may omit the constraint on j_0 and replace it by an appropriate Fourier multiplier cutting of the very high and very low frequencies (not needed if the interval is infinite on either side). This Fourier multiplier can be estimated by the Hardy Littlewood maximal function. Thus we have the pointwise estimate

$$\left| \sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G): j_{v_*}=j_*} \prod_{v \in V} Q_{j_v}^v f_v \right| \leq CM \left| \sum_{j_0 \in \mathbf{Z}} \sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G - \{v_*\}): j_{v_0}=j_0} \prod_{v \in V} Q_{j_v}^v f_v \right|$$

where M is the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator. Taking suprema in j_* and applying the Hardy-Littlewood maximal and Littlewood-Paley inequalities, we obtain

$$\|\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}((f_v)_{v \in V})\|_{p_*} \leq C \left\| \left(\sum_{j_0 \in \mathbf{Z}} \left| \sum_{\vec{j} \in \Omega(G - \{v_*\}): j_{v_0}=j_0} \prod_{v \in V} Q_{j_v}^v f_v \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p_*}.$$

The expression inside the norm on the right-hand side is pointwise bounded by

$$S_{v_0}(f_{v_0}) \Lambda_{G - \{v_*\}}^{[v_0]}((f_v)_{v \in V \setminus \{v_0\}}).$$

The claim then follows by Hölder. The case $V \setminus \{v_0\} = \emptyset$ is again an easy variant of the above without a smaller order maximal paraproduct.

Finally, suppose $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ is semi-direct with two competing frequencies $v_1, v_2 \in V$. We may place this paraproduct in standard form without affecting the property of being semi-direct. But we may then repeat the arguments used to prove (17), and obtain the pointwise estimate

$$\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}((f_v)_{v \in V}) \leq S_{v_1}(f_{v_1}) S_{v_2}(f_{v_2}) \Lambda_{G - \{v_*, v_2\}}^{[v_1]}(\{f_v\}_{v \in V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}}),$$

again with no maximal paraproduct on the right hand side if $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ is empty. The claim then follows from Hölder and the boundedness of the Littlewood-Paley square function on L^p , $1 < p < \infty$.

In light of the preceding discussion and induction, Theorem 2.6 (and hence Theorem 1.1) will follow if we can show

Proposition 2.9. *Every maximal paraproduct $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ can be bounded by a finite collection of good maximal paraproducts of the same order. The cardinality of the collection is bounded by a quantity depending only on the order and complexity of $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$.*

This will be done in the next two sections. The basic idea shall be to exploit variants of the identity

$$\chi_{a < b, a < c} = \chi_{a < b \leq c} + \chi_{a < c < b}$$

as well as (13), (14) to permute the edges of the graph G into a good form.

3. THE CASE OF TWO COMPETING FREQUENCIES

It remains only to prove Proposition 2.9. By the remarks in the previous section it suffices to verify the Proposition when $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ has a dominant frequency or two competing frequencies.

In this section we consider the case of two competing frequencies v_1, v_2 ; this case is less technical than the dominant frequency case. We may place the maximal paraproduct in standard form. The vertex v_2 now plays no significant role, and we shall often work with the reduced graph $G - \{v_2\}$. Let $E - \{v_2\}$ denote the edge set of $G - \{v_2\}$.

Write $G = (V \cup \{v_*\}, E)$. We shall induct on the complexity of G . Suppose inductively that the claim is proven for all maximal paraproducts $\Lambda_{(V \cup \{v_*\}, E')}^{[v_*]}$ with two competing frequencies v_1, v_2 in normal form, with $|E'| < |E|$.

In light of (14) we may replace any edge e in $E - \{v_2\}$ by its dual e^* modulo objects of lower complexity, without disturbing the property of having two competing frequencies in standard form. Thus we may freely reverse the direction of edges in $G - \{v_2\}$ (adjusting the weights accordingly).

We may assume that $G - \{v_2\}$ is connected as an undirected graph, for if $G - \{v_2\}$ split into two disconnected components then $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ is clearly good.

We may also assume that $G - \{v_2\}$ contains no circuits as an undirected graph. To see this, we suppose for contradiction that $G - \{v_2\}$ contained an undirected circuit. By the freedom to reverse the direction of edges in $G - \{v_2\}$ we may assume that this circuit is directed, and has positive weight. But then $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ is identically zero, and we are done.

From the preceding discussion we see that we may assume that $G - \{v_2\}$ is a tree (when viewed as an undirected graph), with no loops or double edges. We may then assume that the vertex v_* is a leaf node (i.e. has degree exactly one), since $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ becomes separable otherwise.

We now induct on the distance from v_* to v_1 in $G - \{v_2\}$ (viewed as an undirected graph). If this distance is 1 then $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ is semi-direct and we are done. Now suppose inductively that the distance is greater than 1. Then v_* is adjacent to some vertex $v' \in V - \{v_1, v_2\}$, which is in turn adjacent to some vertex $v'' \in V - \{v_2\}$, such that v'' is closer to v_1 than v' in $G - \{v_2\}$ (viewed as an undirected graph).

By reversing edges if necessary we may assume that G contains the edges $e_1 = (v_*, v', A_1)$ and $e_2 = (v', v'', A_2)$. Observe that the statement

$$j_{v_*} \geq j_{v'} + A_1 \text{ and } j_{v_*} \geq j_{v''} + A_1 + A_2$$

holds if and only if one of the (exclusive) statements

$$j_{v_*} \geq j_{v'} + A_1 \text{ and } j_{v'} \geq j_{v''} + A_2$$

or

$$j_{v_*} \geq j_{v''} + A_1 + A_2 \text{ and } j_{v''} \geq j_{v'} - A_2 + 1$$

hold. From this and the triangle inequality we have

$$\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) \leq \Lambda_{G - \{e_2\} \cup \{e_3\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) + \Lambda_{G - \{e_1, e_2\} \cup \{e_2^*, e_3\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) \quad (19)$$

where $e_3 := (v_*, v'', A_1 + A_2)$. The first term on the right-hand side is separable, while the second term on the right-hand side can be treated by the induction hypothesis. This completes the inductive argument.

4. THE CASE OF A DOMINANT FREQUENCY

To conclude the proof of Proposition 2.9 and hence Theorem 1.1 it remains only to consider the case when G has a dominant frequency v_0 . In this case we may freely replace G by $G \cup H$, where H is the graph with vertex set $V \cup \{v_*\}$ and edge set

$$\{(v_0, v, 1) : v \in V - \{v_0\}\},$$

since this makes no difference to the maximal paraproduct $\Lambda_G^{[v_*]}$ other than to increase the complexity slightly.

Fix V , v_0 , v_* . The graph H is an example of a *heirarchy*, which we now define.

Definition 4.1. *A heirarchy is a graph $H = (V \cup \{v_*\}, E')$ obeying the following properties.*

- *No edge of E' has v_* as a vertex.*
- *For every $v \in V - \{v_0\}$ there exists a unique directed path $p(v) = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r)$ of edges in E' from v_0 to v . We refer to r , e_r , and $A(p(v))$ as the ranking, link, and depth of v respectively, and define the superior $s(v)$ of v to be the initial vertex of e_r . We define v_0 to have 0 ranking and depth, and no link or superior.*
- *We have $A(p(v)) > 0$ for all $v \in V - \{v_0\}$.*

Note that if H is a heirarchy and G is any graph on $V \cup \{v_*\}$, then $\Lambda_{G \cup H}^{[v_*]}$ automatically has v_0 as a dominant frequency. Indeed one has

$$j_v \leq j_{v_0} - A(p(v)) \tag{20}$$

for all $v \in V$ and $\vec{j} \in \Omega(H)$. Also observe that $H - \{v_*\}$ is necessarily a rooted tree with root v_0 .

Proposition 2.9 now clearly follows from

Proposition 4.2. *Let G be a graph on $V \cup \{v_*\}$ and let H be a heirarchy. Then $\Lambda_{G \cup H}^{[v_*]}$ can be bounded by finitely many good maximal paraproducts. The number of such paraproducts depends only on the complexity and order of G .*

Proof As before, we induct on the complexity of G . We may assume that the proposition is true for all graphs G of lower complexity and all heirarchies H . The inductive hypothesis is allowed to be vacuous when the complexity of G is zero.

By the arguments in the preceding section, we may freely reverse edges in G (but not in H !), and assume that G contains no circuits as an undirected graph.

We may assume that G does not contain any edge which has the same initial and final vertices as one in H , since the edge from G is either redundant or can be used to replace the edge in H , and in either case we can reduce the complexity of G .

We divide into two cases, depending on whether $G - \{v_*\}$ is non-empty or not.

Case 1. Suppose that $G - \{v_*\}$ is non-empty. Then G contains an edge $e = (v, v', A_0)$ for some $v, v' \in V$. By replacing e with its dual if necessary we may assume that

$$A_0 + A(p(v)) > A(p(v')) . \tag{21}$$

If $v' \in p(v)$ (i.e., the path $p(v)$ crosses the vertex v'), then the condition (21) and the fact that H is a heirarchy forces $G \cup H$ to contain a directed circuit of positive weight, so that $\Lambda_{G \cup H}^{[v_*]}$ vanishes. Hence we may assume that $v' \notin p(v)$. In particular we have $v' \neq v_0$.

Let e_1 be the link of v' . From (14) we have

$$\Lambda_{G \cup H}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) \leq \Lambda_{G \cup H - \{e_1\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) + \Lambda_{G \cup H - \{e_1\} \cup \{e_1^*\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}).$$

The graph $G \cup H - \{e_1\}$ can be written as the union of $G - \{e\}$ and $H - \{e_1\} \cup \{e\}$. Since H is a heirarchy, one can verify using (21) that $H - \{e_1\} \cup \{e\}$ is also a heirarchy (in fact, the depth of any vertex either stays constant or increases). Thus this summand is acceptable by the induction hypothesis.

Now consider the contribution of $G \cup H - \{e_1\} \cup \{e_1^*\}$. If the superior $s(v')$ of v' is equal to v_0 then one can see using (21) that this graph contains a directed circuit of positive weight, so the contribution of this graph vanishes. Now suppose $s(v') \neq v_0$. Let e_2 be the link of $s(v')$.

Observe from (20), (21) that the edge e_2 is redundant in $G \cup H - \{e_1\} \cup \{e_1^*\}$:

$$\Omega(G \cup H - \{e_1\} \cup \{e_1^*\}) = \Omega(G \cup H - \{e_1, e_2\} \cup \{e_1^*\}).$$

The graph $G \cup H - \{e_1, e_2\} \cup \{e_1^*\}$ can be written as the union of $G - \{e\}$ and $H - \{e_1, e_2\} \cup \{e, e_1^*\}$. The latter graph can be verified to be a heirarchy using (21) by similar arguments as before, and so this case is also treatable by the induction hypothesis. This concludes the treatment of Case 1.

Case 2. Suppose that $G - \{v_*\}$ is empty. Define the *total ranking* to be the sum of rankings of all the vertices in V which are adjacent to v^* .

We induct on the total ranking. If the total ranking is zero then $\Lambda_{G \cup H}^{[v_*]}$ is semi-direct with dominant frequency v_0 . Now suppose the total ranking is positive. Then v_* is adjacent to at least one vertex v in $V - \{v_0\}$. By reversing edges if necessary, we may assume that G contains an edge e of the form $e = (v_*, v, A_0)$.

Let $e_1 = (s(v), v, A_1)$ be the link of v , and let e_2 denote the edge $e_2 := (v_*, s(v), A_0 - A_1)$. By repeating the derivation of (19) we have the triangle inequality

$$\Lambda_{G \cup H}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) \leq \Lambda_{G - \{e\} \cup \{e_2\} \cup H}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}) + \Lambda_{G \cup H - \{e_1\} \cup \{e_2^*\}}^{[v_*]}(\vec{f}).$$

The first paraprodut on the right-hand side is of the same form as $G \cup H$, but has the total ranking reduced by one, and so can be handled by the induction hypothesis. Since H is a tree, the second paraprodut is separable. This concludes the treatment of Case 2. ■

Proposition 2.9 has now been proven in all cases. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is now complete.

5. PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.2

Fix $n, M_1, \dots, M_n, \pi_{j,i}$ as in Corollary 1.2. Let $m_{j,i}$ denote the symbol of $\pi_{j,i}$. By the hypotheses of the Corollary, pigeonholing, and symmetry we may assume that $m_{j,n}(0) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbf{Z}$. By shifting the summation index we may assume $M_n = 0$.

We may replace the left-hand side of (10) by

$$\left| \sum_j \epsilon_j \int \prod_{i=1}^n \pi_{j,i} f_i \right|$$

where ϵ_j are bounded constants. By absorbing the ϵ_j into $m_{j,n}$ (for instance) we may assume that $\epsilon_j = 1$.

Following [11], we now renormalize the $m_{j,i}$ in a form which allows a good decomposition as a telescopic series. For each integer j , let ϕ_j be a bump function adapted to $[-2^j, 2^j]$ which satisfies $\phi_j(0) = 1$.

For any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we decompose

$$m_{j,i} = m_{j,i}(0)\phi_{j+M_i} + (m_{j,i} - m_{j,i}(0)\phi_{j+M_i}).$$

Thus by decomposition, we may assume that

$$m_{j,i} \text{ is a bounded multiple of } \phi_{j+M_i} \text{ or vanishes at the origin.}$$

Of course when $i = n$ the latter possibility obtains. Whenever the case $m_{j,i}(0)\phi_{j+M_i}$ obtains, we may replace this function by ϕ_{j+M_i} and replace $m_{j,n}$ by $m(j,i)(0)m_{j,n}$. Thus we may assume

$$m_{j,i} \text{ is equal to } \phi_{j+M_i} \text{ or vanishes at the origin.}$$

We set $j_n = j$. If $m_{j,i}$ vanishes at the origin, we set $j_i = j_n + M_i$. If $m_{j,i} = \phi_{j+M_i}$, we consider the lacunary decomposition

$$\phi_{j+M_i} = \sum_{j_i \leq j_n + M_i} \phi_{j_i} - \phi_{j_i-1} \quad .$$

The claim then follows by an application of Theorem 1.1. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] Coifman, R. R and Meyer, Y. *On commutators of singular integrals and bilinear singular integrals*, Trans. AMS 212, pp. 315–331 [1975],
- [2] Coifman, R. R and Meyer, Y. *Commutateurs d'intégrales singulières et opérateurs multilinéaires*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 28, pp. 177–202 [1978],
- [3] Coifman, R. R and Meyer, Y. *Fourier analysis of multilinear convolutions, Calderón's theorem, and analysis of Lipschitz curves.*, Euclidean harmonic analysis (Proc. Sem., Univ. Maryland, College Park, Md.), pp. 104–122, Lecture Notes in Math., 779 [1979].
- [4] Coifman, R. R and Meyer, Y. *Au delà des opérateurs pseudo-différentiels*, Astérisque 57, Société Mathématique de France, Paris 1978.
- [5] Coifman, R. R and Meyer, Y. *Non-linear harmonic analysis, operator theory and P.D.E.*, Beijing Lectures in Analysis, Annals of Math. Studies 112, 3–46 [1986]
- [6] Coifman, R. R and Meyer, Y. *Ondelettes et opérateurs III, Opérateurs multilinéaires*, Actualités Mathématiques, Hermann, Paris 1991
- [7] Grafakos, L. and Kalton, N., *The Marcinkiewicz multiplier condition for bilinear operators*, to appear in Studia Math.
- [8] Muscalu, C., Tao, T., and Thiele, C., *Multi-linear operators given by singular multipliers*, to appear, J. Amer. Math. Soc.
- [9] Muscalu, C., Tao, T., and Thiele, C., *Uniform estimates for multi-linear operators with one dimensional modulation symmetry*, preprint [2001]

- [10] Stein, E. *Harmonic Analysis: Real Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, [1993]
- [11] Thiele, C. *On the Bilinear Hilbert transform*. Universität Kiel, Habilitationsschrift [1998]

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UCLA, LOS ANGELES CA 90095-1555
E-mail address: `camil@math.ucla.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UCLA, LOS ANGELES CA 90095-1555
E-mail address: `tao@math.ucla.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UCLA, LOS ANGELES CA 90095-1555
E-mail address: `thiele@math.ucla.edu`